

## REMARKS

### I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-12 were pending in the application prior to the submission of this response. Claims 1-12 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. The Abstract has been amended for further clarification. No new matter has been introduced.

### II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,696 to Saito, et al. (hereafter, “Saito”).

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the amendments now presented herein. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended for further clarification to recite:

A control device for remotely controlling a controlled device,  
comprising:  
a display unit that displays a control panel of the controlled device;  
a control unit that produces operation information; and  
**a communication unit that sends the operation information to  
the controlled device,**  
**wherein the operation information includes a shifting history  
of a cursor displayed on the control panel, and**  
**wherein the shifting history includes identification information  
of buttons depressed by the cursor in a single operation.** (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Saito does not teach or suggest at least “a communication unit that sends the operation information to the controlled device, wherein the operation information includes a shifting history of a cursor displayed on the control panel, and wherein the shifting history includes identification information of buttons depressed by the cursor in a single operation”, as recited in amended claim 1. Independent claim 5 has been amended to recite similar features to amended claim 1 as described herein.

The Office Action asserts that “the claim language is interpreted in the sense that every button depressed by a user requires for that particular button to be

selected just once. The claim language does not limit the system to *send (via a single operation)* the entire history of the buttons depressed.”

However, Applicants submit that claim 1 currently recites that the communication unit sends the operation information which includes the shifting history and the shifting history includes identification information of buttons depressed by the cursor in a single operation. Thus, it is apparent that the communication unit sends the entire shifting history of buttons depressed by the cursor in a single operation.

Furthermore, Saito discloses that “suppose that a user clicks the icon i206 for “play” in the home page of FIG. 31 (step s4507). This icon i206 for “play” is set in correspondence to the RTSP “PLAY” command by hyperlink, for example. Thus the command data...is transmitted from the first AV connection device 204 to the second AV connection device 205...” (column 36, lines 43-49) Saito does not teach or suggest including, in the shifting history, identification information of buttons depressed by the cursor in a single operation, as required by at least claim 1.

Saito teaches only transmitting a command in response to the clicking of an icon as shown in Figure 31. Saito, however, provides no teaching or suggestion of sending a list of buttons ID's that have been depressed by the cursor.

In view of the above, amended independent claims 1 and 5 are believed distinguishable over Saito for at least the reasons discussed above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Applicants have chosen in the interest of expediting prosecution of this patent application to distinguish the cited documents from the pending claims as set forth above. However, these statements should not be regarded in any way as admissions that the cited documents are, in fact, prior art.

Applicants have not specifically addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that the independent claims from which they respectively depend, either directly or indirectly, are in condition for allowance as set forth above. Accordingly, the dependent claims also are in condition for allowance. Applicants, however, reserve the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary.

In reply to Office Action dated May 2, 2008

Applicants believe that the application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.


**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4798. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No 13-4500, Order No. 1232-4798. A DUPLICATE OF THIS DOCUMENT IS ATTACHED.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 30, 2008

By:   
Nirav S. Amin  
Registration No. 60,884  
(212) 415-8700 Telephone  
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile

Correspondence Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101